

**From:** Fred Foreman/ESC/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 6/21/2012 9:37:34 AM

**To:** "Cynthia Caporale" <Caporale.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov>  
**CC:** Colleen Walling; "costas.robin@epa.gov" <costas.robin@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Glycol Rejected Data

A comment in the report was:

It should also be explained why EPA discontinued use of certain subcontracted labs: Test America (glycols 8015M), Pace Analytical (ethylene glycol 8015M), and added EPA Region 6 lab for analysis of ethylene glycol and propylene glycol (Modified 8270D).

The response is that the Region 6 method utilizes a GC/MS technique that was more selective than the GC/FID method provided by the commercial laboratories.

Fred Foreman, Chief  
Technical Services Branch  
Office of Analytical Services & Quality Assurance  
US EPA Region III  
Ft. Meade, Maryland  
410-305-2629

**From:** Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US  
**To:** Colleen Walling/ESC/R3/USEPA/US, Fred Foreman/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Cc:** costas.robin@epa.gov  
**Date:** 06/21/2012 07:36 AM  
**Subject:** Glycol Rejected Data

Fred or Colleen,

The technical summary being prepared by the data team for Dimock needs a section on why the glycol data results were rejected. Do we have that summary already in one of ESAT's data validation reports? I need to submit this to the data team today.

Fred, this was the technical summary document I sent to you about two weeks ago and this is a section towards the end of the document. I'll forward you the document so you can see what I'm referring to. This version will have the comments from the HQ EU.

Thanks,  
Cindy